

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 17, 2008. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 10, 12, and 19 are in independent form. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claims 1 and 6, as deemed necessary, to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in sections 2 and 3 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2002/0152106 (*Stoxen et al.*). Applicants note that the present application claims priority to *Stoxen et al.* See Spec., page 1. 35 U.S.C. § 120 provides:

An application for patent for an invention disclosed in the manner provided by the first paragraph of section 112 of this title in an application previously filed in the United States, or as provided by section 363 of this title, which is filed by an inventor or inventors named in the previously filed application shall have the same effect, as to such invention, as though filed on the date of the prior application, if filed before the patenting or abandonment of or termination of proceedings on the first application or on an application similarly entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the first application and if it contains or is amended to contain a specific reference to the earlier filed application.

Applicants submit that they have fully satisfied the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 120 with regard to claiming priority to *Stoxen et al.* By Examiner's own admission,

Stoxen et al. teaches all the limitations of the present application. See Office Action, page 3. Thus, the present application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date of *Stoxen et al.*

Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Stoxen et al.* is not available as a prior art reference against the present application, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1943208_1.DOC